

## **Meeting Minutes**

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Tuesday July 11, 2017

---

### **Meeting called to order at 1:37 by Cecilia Estolano**

#### **Welcoming Remarks**

The meeting began with introductions by the PAC representatives and members of the audience.

Ms. Estolano called for a motion to approve the minutes for the June meeting. Jacki Bacharach motioned and Terry Dipple seconded. Mark Christoffels asked for clarification as to why an item discussed in breakout session was not recorded in the minutes. It was clarified that no minutes were taken during the breakout sessions. The July minutes were unanimously approved.

Vivian Rescalvo advised that each of the interim PAC Officers had volunteered to serve in the permanent position. Each constituency group voted unanimously in favor of their standing officer. The position of Chair, First Vice Chair, and Second Vice Chair would be determined after the meeting by a draw of straws.

After discussion, members agreed on the following meeting schedule:

- Meetings would be held on the first Tuesday of every month
  - Exception if the first Tuesday was after a holiday, in which case the meeting would be held on the second Tuesday
- No meeting in August; the first meeting will be on September 12, 2017
- SCAG is the preferred venue

Therese McMillan then began discussing the PAC's Work Plan. The majority of the PAC's work, Therese explained, would be split between the technical/administrative addendums to the Measure M Guidelines and the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Ms. McMillan noted that the PAC would also be called to advise on policy level issues not included in the previous two items. Ms. McMillan reminded members that all items for discussion should be at a policy level, and that the PAC would not focus on any particular project.

Ms. Estolano solicited other issues that PAC Members thought should be added to the discussion items.

Keandra Dodds asked that the PAC find time to address some social equity issues that were not discussed at length during the public comment period. Jessica Meaney added that many of the

consumer issues, including green/complete streets and the TOC policies, were not part of the 5 issues discussed at length. Ms. McMillan noted that Item 3A, a comprehensive list of all comments received by Metro, has comments separated into 3 different categories: A) to be addressed in the administrative guidelines, B) to be wrapped into the LRTP, and C) a policy level issue that needs to be addressed in a different form. She relayed that solutions to comments in Category C could range from an action before the Metro Board to request a policy amendment to a longer-term development session that might be scoped by the PAC.

Ms. Dodds also asked for clarification on TOC policy in the Local Return section of the Guidelines.

Bryn Lindblad expressed concern that some of the items in Category C of Attachment 3A should be included in either the LRTP or the administrative guidelines. Ms. Estolano suggested that the PAC revisit the subject at the end of the meeting to see whether discussion could quell some of the initial uneasiness.

### **Measure M Guidelines – Kalieh Honish (Metro)**

Ms. Honish reviewed Attachment 3A, and introduced an additional attachment: a recap of Board actions at the June 2017 Metro Board meeting that affected the Measure M Guidelines. Ms. Honish also noted that Metro staff was working to update the Guidelines to reflect the actions taken by the Board. She promised to make the updated Guidelines available to the PAC and to the public at [theplan.metro.net](http://theplan.metro.net). Lastly, Ms. Honish introduced Attachment D, an updated list showing where each of the most prevalent comments would be addressed in the administrative procedures, as well as a timeline for the completion of those procedures.

Ms. Honish explained that each section listed on Attachment D would become a Metro staff-lead working group, and that PAC members should choose a few to assist with (4-6 members per section), depending on their level of interest. These working groups would help shape the administrative procedures.

Ms. Estolano asked for clarification regarding how using Local Return dollars on Transit-Oriented Communities (TOCs) specifically would be addressed in the future at a policy level. Ms. McMillan explained that in order for TOCs to be mentioned in the Local Return procedures section of the Guidelines, Metro would need to adopt a TOC policy. Only after the adoption of a TOC policy could the administrative procedures be amended to include language regarding funding TOCs.

Hilary Norton commented that although TOCs should be addressed as a component of Local Return, the business community wanted to see a policy addressing how TOCs would be encouraged going forward. Ms. McMillan responded that Metro concurred, and is developing a TOC section for the LRTP. She added that the language in the Local Return Guidelines serves as a compliment to the LRTP, and is necessary due to the time it will take to develop the final LRTP.

Kerry Cartwright asked for details regarding the admin procedures. He also questioned whether there should be limits on subcommittee involvement. Ms. McMillan explained that the committees needed to

be set up as soon as possible to allow for the timely adoption of the Administrative Procedures. She also explained that task forces were limited in size because large numbers in one group becomes ineffective. Ms. Estolano referenced Mr. Diaz's survey as a place for PAC members to decide which subcommittees they were interested in joining.

Stephanie Ramirez, on behalf of the older adult community, wanted to know when the final Measure M Guidelines would be available. She noted that the older adult community wanted clarification on fund accountability from Metro. Ms. McMillan communicated that Metro staff would get back to her with that information.

Jacki Bacharach asked about the time commitment and workload involved with each of the working groups. Ms. McMillan answered that there would be a range spanning from one or two meetings for the simpler issues to significantly more time for the more controversial topics.

Jessica Meaney noted that she would like to have a work plan laid out in advance in order to formulate a good schedule/timeline. Roderick suggested adding TOC as one of the subcommittees. Ms. Dodds asked for more information about the definition of TOC, and agreed with the idea of forming a working group focused on TOC, even solely to clarify general confusion.

Ms. Estolano suggested that members use the online form created by Mr. Diaz to express which working groups they were interested in supporting. Regarding TOC specifically, Ms. Estolano expressed that more time to discuss and shape the policy might be appropriate.

Thomas Yee and Mr. Diaz clarified that both PAC Representatives and Alternates are eligible and encouraged to participate in the working groups. Mr. Diaz also confirmed that members could sign up for as many fields, and could rank their requests in order of preference.

Jerard Wright (BizFed) suggested that members consider the work plan necessitated by the LRTP before diving into too much detail about the working groups. Ms. Honish agreed and noted that the survey would be distributed after the LRTP presentation.

Ms. McMillan, in response to a discussion that took place prior to the meeting, addressed the idea of a letter of no prejudice that would allow COGs to use their own money to fund projects with the expectation of reimbursement. She recommended that COGs wait to see the final administrative procedures. She emphasized that reimbursement was not guaranteed, and that COGs would be funding projects at their own risk. Ms. McMillan added that Metro would provide an estimate of available funds. Ms. Honish added that it would take about 6 months, but that she would defer to Metro OMB for a concrete answer. She also noted that the first year of tax collection is often an anomaly, and that OMB's estimate included a 5% cushion to account for it.

Ms. Estolano confirmed with Ms. McMillan that the 6-12 month timeline for development of the administrative guidelines started July 1, 2017. She also confirmed that administrative guidelines did not need to go to the Board for adoption.

Steve Lantz expressed concern that with so many different pots of money under the Measure M Plan, jurisdictions would have a hard time anticipating with certainty their reimbursement date. Ms. McMillan assured Mr. Lantz and the PAC that Metro staff was using the 6-month development period to solve this relevant concern. She also reminded the PAC that there was no prioritization of any particular project or program under Measure M; each has the same standing within the next 5 years.

**LRTP Presentation – Kalieh Honish and Manjeet Ranu – Slides available at [theplan.metro.net](http://theplan.metro.net)**

John Bwarie asked for details regarding outreach. Ms. McMillan answered that there are several different ways to outreach: engagement, education, media outreach. Engagement involves community interaction, and focuses on equity. The goal is to make sure all opinions are heard, and all comments are received. Education, Ms. McMillan explained, is important for issues such as state of good repair in order to justify the costs associated with maintaining the system. The media outreach focused on how to engage and keep in close contact with politicians at all levels of government in order to maintain support. Ms. McMillan emphasized that Metro does not want to have a situation where decisions are made behind closed doors with last-minute, cursory attempts to engage the public toward the end of the process.

Monique Lopez wondered about how members of the different groups headed by PAC Representatives could get involved in the process. Mr. Ranu responded that a scope of work and timeline is being developed for each of the modules. Each scope/schedule would include roles for Metro staff, as well as for PAC members and constituents. These scopes contained information on public outreach and engagement.

Ms. Bacharach was concerned that due to the size and diversity of Los Angeles County, Measure M and the LRTP would not be able to fulfill the relatively disjointed vision of the constituents who voted on it. She also noted that the private sector, with the invention of automation, the advancement of drone technology, and the prominence of rideshare programs, should be considered by Metro as potential ways to save a lot of money. Ms. McMillan acknowledged that all of the points raised were valid, and reminded the PAC that the current discussion was very high-level. She assured Ms. Bacharach that the issues would be studied and addressed down the road.

Bryn Lindblad spoke about climate change and encouraged Metro to keep State climate goals in mind when producing LRTP. She also asked that Metro incorporate urban cooling technologies to reduce the existing carbon footprint produced by the roadways of today.

Seleta Reynolds commented that the economic impacts of transit to communities should be strongly considered, despite the fact that it seems intuitive to build transit first and adjust to the impacts later. She noted that many communities had priorities other than transit that would not be addressed due to a lack of funding. Ms. Reynolds emphasized that communication across multiple disciplines would be necessary in order to create a truly revolutionary LRTP that significantly impacted communities in positive way. Ms. McMillan responded by reminding members that Metro cannot work as a housing authority. She noted that while Metro can act as a catalytic initiator of change, but cannot sustain and

maintain it. Ms. McMillan added that Metro does have a partners program in order to attempt to hear from all interested parties.

Mr. Cartwright noted that the Ports had worked with SCAG to produce a funding projection for the next 20 years, and that he was willing and eager to share it with Metro. He also inquired as to whether SB1 had been analyzed by Metro for opportunities for new projects. Ms. McMillan responded that part of Metro's initial analysis included a baseline study where staff would make a list of all potential funds available to them.

Naresh Amatya commented that Metro's LRTP update is coming at the perfect time to be done in conjunction with SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan update. He specifically suggested outreach as an area where Metro and SCAG might be able to work together.

In the interest of time, PAC members decided to push the Metro Strategic Plan presentation to the September meeting. Ms. Meaney and Ms. Estolano agreed that they would like to develop a work plan by the September meeting in order to make the most out of the members' time.

Ms. Estolano adjourned the meeting at 3:30